DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 330 RC 011 879

TITLE	Iowa: Annual Evaluation Report For Migrant Programs. Fiscal Year 1978.
INSTITUTION	Iowa State Dept. of Public Instruction, Des Moines.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE	Jan 79
NOTE	46p.; For a related document, see ED 148 520
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Ancillary Services; Elementary Secondary Education; *Enrichment Programs; Enrollment; Health Services; Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Programs; Interagency Cooperation; *Migrant Education; Parent Participation; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *State Programs; Student Recruitment; *Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Iowa

ABSTRACT

During fiscal year 1978, seven migrant educational programs were operational in Iowa. Five programs were conducted during the regular school year with 139 children attending, 84 of whom were classified as speaking primarily Spanish. Three summer programs were conducted for 191 children, 160 of whom were classified as having Spanish for their primary language. Children were recruited through visits to the camps and assistance from migrant families and other migrant agencies. Inservice training and staff development activities were conducted during both terms. Children received a physical examination and dental screening, with additional medical referrals made when needed. Parents were involved through attendance at orientation meetings, in planning project activities, classroom visitations, and acting as aides. Program information was disseminated via home and camp parental visits, council meetings, and press radio releases. Among cooperating agencies were the Migrant Action Program, county health departments, Iowa State Employment Service, Iowa Department of Social Services, community action agencies, and Child Nutrition Programs. Included in the report are records of participants by age level in the program instructional activities and narrative excerpts from evaluative reports of the summer program in Muscatine and the regular school programs in Columbus and West Liberty. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183330

CS 011879

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James F
Bettenfield

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

5200-D0542-1/79

State of Iowa
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Jolly Ann Davidson, President, Clarinda
John E. van der Linden, Vice President, Sibley
Cornelius Bodine, Jr., Sioux City
William N. Cropp, Des Moines
Karen K. Goodenow, Wall Lake
Virginia Harper, Fort Madison
Robert G. Koons, Clinton
Susan M. Wilson, Waterloo
(Vacancy)

ADMINISTRATION

Robert D. Benton, State Superintendent and Executive Officer of the State Board of Public Instruction
David H. Bechtel, Administrative Assistant
James E. Mitchell, Deputy State Superintendent

Pupil Personnel Services Branch

Drexel D. Lange, Associate Superintendent
Oliver T. Himley, Chief, Title I, ESEA
James F. Bottenfield, Migrant Consultant, Title I, ESEA

IOWA

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR MIGRANT PROGRAMS

FISCAL YEAR 1978

Title I of Public Law 89-10

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
As Amended

State of Iowa
Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, Iowa

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Unduplicated Number of Children and Staff	1
Inservice for Staff	2
Medical	4
Recruiting and Establishing Educational Needs	4
Parent Involvement	5
Cooperation With Other Programs and Agencies	6
Dissemination	6
SEA Contact With LEAs	6
Instructional Activities	6
Narative Excerpts from LEA Evaluation Reports	11
Muscatine Summer School Program	13
Columbus Regular School Program	23
West Liberty Regular School Program	39

TABLES

Page

Instructional Activities (Regular School Term) 8

Instructional Activities (Summer School Term) 9

Attachment A

Muscatine Language Development Summer Program Attendance Comparison 19

Attachment C

Muscatine Title I Product Evaluation Language Development -- Reading 20

Attachment C

Muscatine Title I Product Evaluation Language Development -- Math 21

Table I

Columbus Migrant Students Who Participated in Program 26

Table II

Columbus ITBS Scores, Reading (Migrant Participants) 28

Table III

Columbus Eligible Migrant Students Not In Program 29

Table IV

Columbus ITBS Scores, Reading (Eligible Migrant Non-Participants) 30

Table V

Number of Days Absent Per Quarter for Migrant Participants (Columbus). 33

Table VI

Number of Days Absent Per Quarter for Eligible Non-Participants (Columbus) 34

IOWA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
FOR MIGRANT PROGRAMS

Title I, ESEA
Fiscal Year 1978

During Fiscal Year 1978, there were seven migrant educational programs operational in Iowa. There were five programs operational during the regular school year and three programs during the summer months.

I. Unduplicated Number of Children and Staff

There were one hundred thirty-nine children served by educational program activities during the regular school year. The breakdown in migrant classifications was eleven intrastate, forty-eight interstate, and eighty five-year provisional. Eighty-four of the children were classified as being Spanish Language dominant.

The staffing for the regular year programs included eight professional, two paraprofessional, and one volunteer aide. Six of the professional staff members were bilingual in Spanish and English. The two paraprofessional members were also bilingual in the two languages. In addition to the migrant funded staff, there were three bilingual professionals funded by regular Title I program funds.

There were one hundred ninety-one children in attendance during the summer school term. The breakdown in migrant classification was seventeen intrastate, eighty-nine interstate, and eighty-five five-year provisional. One hundred sixty of these children were classified as being Spanish Language dominant.

The summer term staffing included sixteen professional and seven paraprofessional for the educational program activities.

Additional personnel included five food service, one social worker, two nurses, and five bus drivers funded by Title I migrant monies.

The preschool and day care services for migrant children was ably handled under the auspices of Migrant Action Program Inc.. In the areas of transportation and recruiting, joint funding of Title I migrant funds and Migrant Action Program funds were utilized; however, in the main, the preschool and day care program was funded and carried out by Migrant Action Program personnel. There were eighty children served by a staff of thirty-two attendants. They also provided two nurses, a medical education mobil unit with a staff of two, seven food services people, three transportation, and one recruiter. This information pertains only to the three Title I migrant education summer programs and does not begin to reflect the total program of services provided to migrants by the Migrant Action Program.

II. Inservice for Staff

Inservice training and staff development activities during the regular school term, as reported by the LEAs, indicate a considerable range. The activities and a duplicated count of staff members participating are as follows:

A. Discussion by staff of individual children --
(Nine teachers, two aides, two nurses, and five administrators)

B. Methods in curriculum in migrant education --
(Nine teachers, two aides, and five administrators)

C. Individualized instruction/grouping techniques --
(Nine teachers, two aides, and three administrators)

D. Classroom management techniques -- (Six teachers, two aides, and two administrators)

E. Preschool education -- (Two teachers and one administrator)

F. Developing teacher made tests -- (Two teachers and one administrator)

G. Oral language development -- (Ten teachers and one administrator)

A total of ten days were set aside for inservice training by the five LEAs with a range of two to six days for the individual schools.

The summer school inservice and staff development activities were as follows:

A. Writing behavioral objectives -- (Two teachers)

B. Discussion by staff of individual children -- (Fourteen teachers, six aides, one nurse, one food service, two administrators, and one transportation)

C. Methods in curriculum in migrant education -- (Fourteen teachers, five aides, and one administrator)

D. Individualized instruction/grouping techniques -- (Fourteen teachers, six aides, and two administrators)

E. Classroom management techniques -- (Five teachers and one administrator)

F. Migrant Student Record Transfer System -- (Nine teachers, one nurse, and one administrator)

III. Medical

During the regular school term, all of the migrant children received a physical screening by the school nurses. As a follow-up to the initial screenings, additional referrals were made to dentists and doctors.

There were twenty-nine children who received a dental screening and eight of them received dental treatment. There were thirty-seven children referred for additional physical examination and ten of them received medical treatment.

During the summer school term, one hundred thirty-four children received a dental screening and two of them were given dental treatment. One hundred six children received physical examinations and twenty-one received medical assistance.

IV. Recruiting and Establishing Educational Needs

The recruitment of migrant children during the regular and summer school terms utilized a variety of methods. School personnel visited the migrant camps and established contact with the parents. They were assisted by the migrant families in locating isolated migrant families. Contact was made with the growers who supplied approximate dates of arrival of the migrants. Some parents voluntarily sent their children when the school bus made its daily rounds.

In establishing the educational needs of the children, the schools utilized teacher judgement backed up by standardized testing, criterion reference tests, teacher made tests, and parent referrals.

V. Parent Involvement

The regular school term reports from the LEAs, indicated an unduplicated count of fifty-one parents involved. The areas of parent involvement breaks down as follows:

A. Attended orientation meetings (Nineteen parents)

B. Involved in planning project activities (Seven parents)

C. Classroom or program visitation (Thirty-three parents)

D. Active in recruitment or support of project activities (Nine parents)

E. Acted as aides (Two parents)

F. Contacted by school staff at home (Fifty-eight parents)

The summer school term reports from the LEAs, indicated an unduplicated count of eighty-seven parents involved. The parent involvement breaks down as follows:

A. Attended orientation meetings (Twelve parents)

B. Involved in planning project activities (Five parents)

C. Classroom or program visitation (Twenty-four parents)

D. Active in recruitment or support of project activities (Seven parents)

E. Helped supervise field trips (Two parents)

F. Acted as aides, paid or volunteer (Twenty-one parents)

G. Contacted by school staff at home (Seventy-six parents)

VI. Cooperation With Other Programs and Agencies

There was excellent cooperation by other agencies in assisting the LEAs to provide a well balanced program of services to the migrant children. These agencies were: Migrant Action Program, County Health Departments, Iowa State Employment Service, Iowa Department of Social Services, Community Action Agencies, Local Title I Projects, Child Nutrition Programs, Head Start, Local Migrant Councils, and Area Education Agencies.

VII. Dissemination

Dissemination of information concerning the Title I migrant program activities, as reported by the LEAs, were:

A. Parent Advisory Council meetings

B. Home and camp visits with parents

C. Parent meetings at scheduled events and during drop-in intervals at school

D. School program newsletters

E. Regular press and radio information

VIII. SEA Contact With LEAs

Contact between the state and local educational agencies was throughout the year. These contacts were on a formal and an informal basis. Assistance was given in completion of the application forms. Consultations were held with each LEA during the planning phase of their program. Visitations were made to each of the LEAs during their program operation.

IX. Instructional Activities

The LEAs reported that, in their opinion, the instructional

activities were successful. The following composite of types of activities and participants by age, fairly represents the program offered to the children.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

INSTRUCTIONS: This page is to be utilized in recording success data. Beside each activity that was part of your project indicate:

A. The number of participants by age level.
B. The number meeting your standard(s) of success by age level.
C. Total number of participants per activity.
D. The methods utilized in determining success.

REGULAR SCHOOL TERM

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		AGE LEVEL						c. Total No. of participants	d. CHECK ONE OR MORE METHODS UTILIZED IN DETERMINING SUCC				
		3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 10	11 - 12	13 - 14	15 - 16		Standardized Tests	Teacher-Made Tests	Criterion Reference	Checklists	Observation
Mathematics	A		29	10	6			45	X	X		X	X
	B		26	9	5								
Language Arts/ Reading	A	10	45	30	16	15	7	123	X	X	X	X	X
	B	9	44	25	12	10	3						
Physical Education	A												
	B												
Fine Arts	A												
	B												
Cultural Development	A		29	12	7	6	2	56				X	X
	B		28	12	6	6	2						
Health/ Nutrition	A												
	B												
Environment	A												
	B												
Science	A												
	B												
Self Image	A	10	42	26	14	6	2	56					
	B	10	39	22	10	5	1						
Music/Dance	A												
	B												
Social Studies	A												
	B												
Oral Communication	A	10	45	28	15	13	2	113	X	X	X	X	X
	B	9	42	26	12	8	2						
Other	A												
	B												

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

INSTRUCTIONS: This page is to be utilized in recording success data. Beside each activity that was part of your project indicate:

A. The number of participants by age level.
B. The number meeting your standard(s) of success by age level.
C. Total number of participants per activity.
D. The methods utilized in determining success.

SUMMER PROGRAMS

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		AGE LEVEL						c. Total No. of participants	d. CHECK ONE OR MORE METHODS UTILIZED IN DETERMINING SUCC					
		3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 10	11 - 12	13 - 14	15 - 16		Standardized Tests	Teacher-Made Tests	Criterion Reference	Checklists	Observation	
Mathematics	A	8	51	42	34	15		150						
	B	4	37	34	32	15			X	X	X	X		
Language Arts/ Reading	A	8	45	44	34	18		149						
	B	4	35	40	31	17			X	X	X	X		
Physical Education	A		53	24	19	7		151						
	B		44	22	18	6						X	X	
Fine Arts	A	14	53	24	19	7		177						
	B	12	44	22	18	6							X	
Cultural Development	A	14	53	24	19	7		177						
	B	12	44	22	18	6							X	X
Health/ Nutrition	A													
	B													
Environment	A													
	B													
Science	A													
	B													
Self Image	A	14	53	24	19	7		177						
	B	12	44	22	18	6							X	
Music/Dance	A													
	B													
Social Studies	A													
	B													
Oral Communication	A	14	53	24	19	7		177						
	B	12	44	22	18	6				X		X		
Other	A													
	B													

X. Narative Excerpts from LEA Evaluation Reports

A. Muscatine Summer School Program

B. Columbus Regular School Program

C. West Liberty Regular School Program

Pg 11- blank

MUSCATINE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM

Fiscal Year 1978

Narrative Evaluation

Again this summer, all educational activities for elementary age students in Muscatine were under the direction of one summer school administrator.

Five different program components functioned, with all but one component, elementary band, housed in the air conditioned Franklin School Elementary Attendance Center. The elementary band sessions were conducted in the Central Junior High band room where band instruments and the appropriate physical facilities were available.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

A continuous progress multi-age grouping approach to the instructional task was provided for the language development program participants.

Our first instructional priority was to identify each student's functional reading, spelling, and math skills levels by administering pretests to diagnose specific skills needs. The prescriptive phase of instruction followed, which involved development of individualized programs designed to afford maximum assistance in the acquisition of new language skills of expression and comprehension as well as the improvement of basic math concepts.

Students were posttested upon completion of learning activities covering specific reading skills and upon completion of instructional activities designed for mastery of basic computational skills in math.

Bilingual Mexican-American students were taught basic phonics and the decoding skills utilizing the "English as a Second Language" instructional technique.

A recently adopted ESL textbook series, English Around the World,

(Scott-Foresman Company) was successfully utilized as our basic reading/language text for the various levels of student development. This flexible, ungraded program, guides children to learn English as they did their first language -- by listening and speaking.

The six language development summer session instructors were truly bilingual and had taught either during previous Muscatine migrant summer programs or had been employed as language development instructors during the regular school year in Muscatine and West Liberty.

The language development program's average daily attendance consisted of 92.6 students and included 67 interstate and intrastate migrant children and 66 "settled-out" Mexican-American pupils. From a total of 133 migrant students registered, 72 attended our summer session for the first time.

Reports of the day-by-day comparison of the language development program's average daily attendance for the past three summers are shown in Attachment A.

The type of individualized continuous progress programming we conduct, designed for educationally disadvantaged students, necessitates maintenance of reasonable student-teacher ratios within each classroom. This summer, the language development program's pupil-teacher ratio was 15.4 to 1.

In terms of satisfying or fulfilling the stated program goals and objectives, we feel the language development program was very successful.

The following goals and objectives were identified to provide program direction and to measure instructional effectiveness.

1. Development and reinforcement of reading, language, and math skills of the enrollees.

2. Development of positive student attitudes toward school and about themselves through utilization of an individualized continuous progress approach.

3. Enriching the experiences of our migrant, settled-out migrant, in an integrated program setting.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

I. Early primary level enrollees will be expected to achieve an average gain of 35 percentile points during the six week summer session as measured by the Metropolitan Readiness Test, Levels I and II.

II. By the end of the six week instructional program, the average reading skills growth of the late primary and intermediate level students will be ten (10) as measured by the Fountain Valley Reading Assessment Program.

III. The basic computational math skills of the late primary and intermediate level students will improve at an average rate of 1.5 months during the six week instructional program as measured by the Houghton Mifflin Individualized Computational Skills, pre and post assessment instruments.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION

Level I, Forms P and Q, of the 1976 edition of the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test were administered to the language development early primary level students in a pre-post sequence to measure growth during the six week session.

The average readiness gain of 23.5 percentile points reflects substantial skills improvement for these four through eight year olds whose first language had been Spanish and who were now beginning to acquire "English as a Second Language" reading readiness skills. Even though this group of early primary level youngsters did not achieve our performance objective of 35 percentile points, their progress was satisfactory during the short six week span of summer school.

The remainder of the language development students in the nine through fourteen age range, achieved our program objective for acquisition of ten reading/language skills by gaining an average of 10.1 reading/language skills as measured by the Fountain Valley Reading Assessment Program.

The Individualized Computational Skills program achievement tests, Form A and B, administered in a pre and posttest sequence, revealed an average math

skills growth of 4.8 months by migrant students in the six through fourteen age range during our brief summer session. Thus, the language development students exceeded the program's performance objective of 1.5 months by 3.3 months, which represents very significant skills achievement. See Attachment C for a complete test summary.

PROGRAM CRITIQUE

The migrant/settled-out migrant composition of our 1978 language development enrollment indicates similar numbers from both categories of students were in attendance.

Slightly more than half of the summer enrollees, 67, were "interstate" migrant children denoting a continuing involvement by many families in the migration from one state to another in pursuit of agricultural or related food processing activities.

Although the summer language development program provides supplemental educational experiences for migrant/former migrant children residing within the boundaries of three local school districts, the preponderance of summer participants, 100, resided within the confines of the Muscatine Community School District.

A trend away from "camp" type residency for the larger migrant families was observed as family groups resided temporarily in rented Muscatine homes and apartments in place of the smaller migrant camp living quarters located primarily in the L and M School District.

Only six true migrant students were transported daily from the L and M School District compared to 18 from the same district the previous summer.

Twenty-seven pupils were enrolled from the West Liberty School District which represents a slight increase above last summer's West Liberty enrollment of 25 migrant/settled-out migrant students.

Restructuring of the summer remedial program is being considered which

would place students in their own neighborhood schools rather than being assigned to one summer attendance center.

In my opinion, the present remedial summer program organization is the most efficient and educationally beneficial approach to meeting the special needs of our remedial students for the following reasons:

1. The prekindergarten and kindergarten classes serve youngsters who have not been previously taught by the building Title I teacher. One of the most important program goals for these students is providing many opportunities for successful group participation and interaction which would not be possible if they meet with a Title I instructor on a small group or one-to-one basis.

   During the summer we have employed either a preschool or early primary level experienced teacher who has been familiar with the instructional techniques and curriculum requirements of this particular age level.

2. One attendance center brings together children with similar learning problems who can be taught in larger groups, thus maximizing the instructional services of the small staff of instructors employed.

3. Most children will function better in a competitive atmosphere in which they compete on a peer skill level.

4. Instructional resources from both the remedial and migrant programs can be shared when both programs are housed together. This arrangement provides many additional learning opportunities beneficial to enrollees from these programs. If the remedial students are assigned to their neighborhood attendance centers, the number of instructional resources available will be limited to those learning aids they have used throughout the school year. During the summer, these disadvantaged pupils can best be motivated by utilizing new and different instructional materials.

5. A classroom environment rather than a resource setting represents a more suitable setting for remedial students to acquire more acceptable behavior characteristics.

6. The present summer facility, Franklin School, is air conditioned, which is absolutely essential to provide an adequate "climate" for learning during the hot summer months. The majority of our neighborhood schools do not have air conditioned classroom facilities available.

7. Our program test results suggest that remedial as well as migrant language development students are achieving a high degree of success in the attainment of our specific program instructional objectives.

In conclusion, I believe our individual pre and post criterian referenced test results, the positive individual student reactions to the daily instructional routine, and the pupil progress records maintained throughout the six week term, offer sufficient evidence that our summer educational programming continues to afford both remedial and migrant students appropriate and beneficial compensatory learning experiences that have contributed significantly to their educational advancement.

I recommend continuation of the present successful summer school organization during the Summer of 1979.

Jerry W. Lange
Summer Program Director

ATTACHMENT A

MUSCATINE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT
SUMMER PROGRAM ATTENDANCE COMPARISON

Day of Program	Number in Attendance Summer 1976	Summer 1977	Summer 1978
1st	70	49	67
2nd	73	83	81
3rd	74	70	66
4th	90	92	93
5th	89	94	98
6th	90	89	96
7th	91	99	90
8th	92	105	99
9th	91	110	94
10th	58	111	93
11th	90	101	90
12th	91	93	85
13th	92	114	94
14th	79	115	77
15th	81	121	89
16th	89	129	96
17th	70	123	102
18th	81	111	97
19th	76	125	111
20th	75	114	100
21st	87	121	97
22nd	75	96	101
23rd	85	101	110
24th	79	103	99
25th	81	116	96
26th	84	106	93
27th	77	74	81
28th	83	96	96
29th	82	103	94
Average Daily Attendance	81.9	100.6	92.6

ATTACHMENT C

TITLE I PRODUCT EVALUATION
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT -- READING

Code of Activity	Age Level	Test Code	Type of Score	Number Children Pre-Post Tested	Average Skills Gain	Subjective Evaluation Rating High 1	2	3	4	Low 5
Reading	4-6	Metr. Rdg. Rdns.	%	14	36%		X			
Reading	7-8	Metr. Rdg. Rdns.	%	13	11%			X		
Reading	9-10	Fountain Valley	Skills	13	13.0	X				
Reading	9-13	Fountain Valley	Skills	18	10.1	X				
Reading	11-14	Fountain Valley	Skills	5	7.2		X			

Average Readiness Gain = 23.5

Average Skills Gain = 10.1

ATTACHMENT C

TITLE I PRODUCT EVALUATION
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT -- MATH

Code of Activity	Age Level	Test Code	Type of Score	Number Pretested	Date of Pretest		Average Pretest Score	Number Post Tested	Date of Posttest		Average Post Test Score	Subjective Evaluation Rating				
					Yr.	Mo.			Yr.	Mo.		1	2	3	4	5
Math	6-8	Form A&B I.C.S.P.	Grade Equiv.	16	78	7	1.2	16	78	8	1.5	X				
Math	7-8	Form A&B I.C.S.P.	Grade Equiv.	21	78	7	2.1	21	78	8	2.5	X				
Math	9-10	Form A&B I.C.S.P.	Grade Equiv.	10	78	7	2.9	10	78	8	3.5	X				
Math	9-13	Form A&B I.C.S.P.	Grade Equiv.	17	78	7	3.9	17	78	8	4.5	X				
Math	11-14	Form A&B I.C.S.P.	Grade Equiv.	10	78	7	6.5	10	78	8	7.4	X				

Pretest Average Grade Equivalent -- 2.52

Posttest Average Grade Equivalent -- 3.00

Average Grade Equivalent Growth = 4.8 Months

COLUMBUS REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM

Fiscal Year 1978

Narrative Evaluation

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

Twenty-three students were initially classified as being eligible for assistance through the Title I migrant program. Of these, ten of the twenty-two were determined to be in need of assistance. Six of these students were elementary age, three junior high, and one high school. One full time teacher was hired cooperatively with Title I funds and funds from our district. This instructor also worked with other bilingual students who could not meet the classification of migrant. The teacher worked one-half day of each day at the elementary level and one-half day divided between the junior high and high school level. Almost all of the students are English dominant. The emphasis at the elementary level was at the development of language receptivity and oral language development. At the junior high level the emphasis was placed on corrective reading and tutoring in the classroom subject areas when needed. High school students used the instructor as a tutor in their subject areas.

In addition to working with the students, the instructor also acted as a resource person to the regular classroom teachers. In this capacity, the bilingual instructor sat in on parent conferences, secured materials, instructed entire classes in Spanish enrichment exercises, performed units in the classrooms on Spanish and Mexican cultures, and coordinated an International Cultural Awareness Day for the elementary students at the Conesville Elementary Center. The instructor also made home visits on behalf of the school when necessary.

During the second semester a Parent Advisory Council was formulated. Two meetings were held, both of which were productive relative to the generation

Pg 22 — blank

of ideas for future programming. The members agreed to serve again next year and to expand their numbers.

Students were referred to the program by classroom teachers, testing information from the previous year, and academic background. Each home was visited by the bilingual teacher and written consent by parents secured. The bilingual teacher administered pretests, using the Peabody Receptive Vocabulary Test and the Doren Diagnostic Test for the elementary students; the Pretest for the Corrective Reading Program with the junior high students; and the Peabody Vocabulary Test with the high school students. Goals were written outlining the programming for each participant. At the end of the first semester, a mid-year report was written on each student. Posttesting with the same instruments were administered to each student and a final report with recommendations was written for each participant. These reports are on file in the individual student's folders.

The instructor met with the elementary students on a daily basis utilizing a pull-out model whereby the students came to the bilingual room for instruction. Class periods at the elementary level varied from 20 to 40 minutes per day. At the junior high level, the instructor met with the students three times per week for periods of forty minutes each. High school students met the instructor two or three times per week, depending upon individual needs and schedules.

PRETEST AND POSTTEST RESULTS

By looking at the instruction activities sheet which is part of this report, the reader will note that numbers are reported for the categories of Language Arts/Reading, Oral Communication, and Other. A total of 22 students are reported. One of the students who began the program did not finish due to mid-year transfer to a program for the hearing impaired. This individual

was receiving bilingual assistance up to that point. The students reported in the category of Oral Communication were the elementary students who received direct assistance from the instructor in oral language development. Table I indicates the age of each student, the criteria used to measure success, and whether or not that criteria was met. A student was adjudged to have generally met the criteria for oral communication if he or she had a "yes" marked for the majority of criteria listed for him or her. Standards used to judge success in each of the areas were:

Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Reading Subtest, taken in April of 1978,--the student was successful in this area if he/she advanced a year or more in grade equivalent.

Peabody Receptive Vocabulary Test--the student was judged as having successfully met criteria in this area if he/she advanced in mental age at least one year as indicated by pretest and posttest results.

Del Rio Screening Test--the student was judged as having successfully met criteria if he/she advanced at least ten percentile points in three of the five subtest areas in both English and Spanish.

Teacher Observation--the student was judged as having successfully met criteria if the classroom teacher recommended student for promotion to the next grade level.

Corrective Reading Program--the student was judged as having successfully met the criteria if he/she made sufficient progress as reported by the instructor on pretest and posttest scores. This progress was judged as sufficient based upon number of errors on pretest versus posttest.

The reader will note that these criteria vary from those originally proposed on the project application. The rationale for the change in these tests were that the instructor believed the results to be of more educational benefit for working with the student.

TABLE I

Migrant Students Who Participated in Program

Student	Age	Criteria of Success	Criteria Met Yes	No
1	6	Del Rio Screening Test		X
		ITBS		X
		Teacher Observation		X
2	7	Peabody Receptive Vocabulary	X	
		ITBS		X
		Teacher Observation	X	
3	9	Peabody Receptive Test		X
		ITBS	X	
		Teacher Observation	X	
4	8	Peabody Receptive Vocabulary		X
		ITBS	X	
		Teacher Observation	X	
5	9	Peabody Receptive Vocabulary		X
		ITBS		X
		Teacher Observation		X
6	11	Peabody Receptive Vocabulary		X
		ITBS		X
		Teacher Observation	X	
7	13	Corrective Reading Program	X	
		ITBS	X	
		Teacher Observation	X	
8	12	Corrective Reading Program	X	
		ITBS	X	
		Teacher Observation		X
9	18	Graduated	X	
		Passed all Classes	X	

Table I indicates that five of the nine students met the majority of the criteria used to evaluate their individual success. Of the five who did not, students number one and five failed to meet criteria in all three areas; student number six failed in two of the three areas.

According to test results, only one elementary student has made one year's growth in the Peabody Receptive Vocabulary Test and only two of the elementary students and one of the junior high students advanced a year or more on the reading subtest of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. The one high school student listed did not take ITBS. The criteria stated for this individual at the beginning of the year was that graduation requirements would be met. This goal was achieved. Table II summarizes the grade equivalent scores of the elementary and junior high participants on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading Subtest. Column two indicates the grade level of the student; column three the 1977 grade equivalent; column four the 1978 grade equivalent; column five the difference between the two scores.

Table III deals with those students who, because of their status, were eligible for participation, but were not placed in the program at the beginning of the school year based upon pretesting results and/or recommendations by the classroom teacher. The criteria in column three was growth of one year or more on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills Reading Subtest. The criteria used to measure success of the three high school students was that they passed all regular academic courses. Table IV shows the 1977 ITBS scores and the 1978 ITBS scores, reading subtest. It will be noted that student number ten advanced only .5 of one year's growth and yet was listed as having met criteria on Table III. The rationale was that this student's composite score advanced well over a year for the entire test and that the reading subtest is still considerably above grade level. It will also be noted by comparing Tables III and IV that the three individuals who were listed as not having met the criteria in Table III did advance in their test scores, although less than one year.

TABLE II

ITBS Scores, Reading
Migrant Participants

Student	Grade	G.E. 1977-78		Diff
1	1	1.3		----
2	2	2.2	2.0	-.2
3	3	2.3	3.7	+1.4
4	3	2.1	3.1	+1.0
5	3	1.3	1.3	± 0
6	4	2.3	2.3	± 0
7	7	4.1	5.5	+1.4
8	7	5.2	5.4	+ .4

TABLE III

Eligible Migrant Students Not In Program

Student	Age	Criteria to Measure Success	Met Criteria Yes	No
1	7	ITBS	X	
2	8	ITBS		X
3	8	ITBS	X	
4	9	ITBS	X	
5	9	ITBS		X
6	9	ITBS	X	
7	9	ITBS	X	
8	11	ITBS		X
9	12	ITBS	X	
10	13	ITBS	X	
11	14	Passed all Courses	X	
12	15	Passed all Courses	X	
13	16	Passed all Courses	X	

TABLE IV

ITBS Scores, Reading
Eligible Migrant Non-Participants

Student	Grade	G.E. 1977-78		Diff
1	1			
2	3	2.7	3.2	+.5
3	3	2.4	4.1	+1.7
4	4	4.3	6.1	+1.8
5	4	3.6	4.0	+.4
6	4	3.5	4.6	+1.1
7	4	5.5	6.8	+1.3
8	6	4.7	5.2	+.5
9	8	5.1	7.6	2.5
10	8	9.1	9.6	.5

In summary, the testing for those students who received daily instruction from the Title I migrant teacher showed poor growth in the areas tested, with some individual exceptions. This is consistent with those students classroom performance and the degree of severity of their learning problems.

COMPLETION OF STATED OBJECTIVES

Except for the testing results, most of those objectives listed in the project application were met. The diagnostic procedures listed in Section II number one, of the application were followed. Reports are filed in the individual student's folders. The procedures for developing and implementing remediation plans for each student were followed as outlined in Section II, number two, of the application. The activity did supplement basic academic instructional services as outlined in Section II, number three, and supportive services listed in number four of the same section were used.

Performance objectives were mentioned in Section III of the application. These objectives and degree to which each were met are discussed below.

1. The student will show a mean growth of 5 NCEs in the progress in the subtest area wherein they have received assistance, as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

   Comment: This objective was not met since a decision was made to change the testing instrument. In addition, this year the Title I office recommended that local districts not attempt to convert scores to NCEs as was done by this district's Title I program last year. Test results were discussed above.

2. The student will demonstrate increased ability in oral expression in both the English and the Spanish languages as measured by teacher made tests and observation and testing.

   Comment: Testing results for those students who worked on this objective were discussed above. In working with the elementary students to develop concepts in both English and Spanish, the subjective judgement of the instructor was that progress was made in this area in most cases.

3. Student absenteeism for unexcused reasons will average four days or less per quarter.

   Comment: Table V lists total number of absences for those children who received instruction in the program. With one exception, this goal was met, that is, a maximum of 16 days absence for the entire year. The individual who exceeded that number was withdrawn from school for an extended period of time by his parents to travel out-of-state. Table VI shows the number of days absent for each student who was eligible for instruction but did not receive it from the bilingual teacher.

4. Classroom teachers will utilize the project teacher (or AEA consultant) as a resource person for bicultural activities during the school year.

   Comment: This goal was met to the point of where, at times, it was interferring with the migrant teacher's meetings with her own students.

5. The project teacher will assist the classroom teacher with instructional devices and materials to be used for the bilingual students in the regular classroom.

   Comment: This goal was met. At the high school level, the instructor helped the regular instructors rewrite tests, find materials, and explained lessons to the students in Spanish, when needed.

6. The home of each participant will be visited by one or more staff members during the school year.

   Comment: This goal was met.

7. Multicultural awareness will be increased as evidenced by at least one school-wide celebration emphasizing the contribution of the Spanish-American culture to our country's heritage.

   Comment: This goal was met by means of an International Cultural Day which was held at the Conesville Elementary School in May. The bilingual instructor coordinated the event.

8. The child will perform noticeably better in the classroom as measured by teacher observation of pupil performance on assignments,

TABLE V

NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT PER QUARTER FOR MIGRANT PARTICIPANTS

Student	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Total
1	0	3	4	1	8
2	1	3	1	1	6
3	0	3	1	1	5
4	0	5	3	2	6.5
5	3	2	12	0	17
6	0	1	3	0	4
7					12
8					7.5
9					13

TABLE VI

Number of Days Absent Per Quarter for Eligible Non-Participants

Student	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Total
1	0	4	5.5	0	9.5
2	1	0	15	8.5	24.5
3	.5	0	2	0	2.5
4	6	6.5	2	4	18.5
5	0	3	6	5	14
6	0	2	8	0	10
7	.5	0	12	8	20.5
8	.5	0	0	1	1.5
9					11.5
10					15.5
11					11.5
12					3
13					26.5

classroom recitation, and positive self-concept.

Comment: Generally this goal seems to have been met based upon feedback from classroom teachers. In some individual cases this goal was not met.

9. Increased involvement from the Hispanic community will be obtained as measured by attendance at school sponsored events and meetings.

Comment: Two meetings were held with parents to discuss the bilingual program. Good feedback was attained by those present. Hispanic parents were among those who participated in the multicultural day. Two Hispanic parents also participated on the Title I Reading Parent Advisory Committee. During the year the local church group representing the Hispanic members of the community used the school facilities for one of their meetings.

10. A Parent Advisory Committee composed of at least three parents of children in the program will be organized and operational as measured by attendance at PAC meetings.

Comment: A committee was organized and two meetings held. No parents of children who received instruction were on the committee. Two parents of children who were eligible but did not require instruction were on the committee, as well as two other Hispanic parents and one Anglo community member who had been instrumental in setting up the teacher corp program in the community in 1974-75.

The persons on the committee were forthright with ideas of how the program should be organized. Some suggestions will be implemented next year.

11. Each student in the program will advance to the next grade level at the end of the next school year.

Comment: This goal was not achieved. One student is being retained, a second has been recommended for retention, but the parents have requested that the child not be retained. Documentation is on file in the individual students' folders.

12. There will be no drop-out students at the junior high and high school level.

Comments: This goal was attained for those students in the program receiving assistance.

AREAS OF STRENGTH OF THE PROGRAM

In the opinion of this evaluator, the major strengths of the program are:

1. Provides a means for communication between home and school.
2. Even though the testing did not indicate a high degree of success, it has provided a beginning for the development of an oral language program designed at strengthening skills in both languages.
3. The teachers have used the bilingual instructor as a resource person to a much greater degree than previously.
4. The diagnostic work of the bilingual instructor has provided some insights to areas in the regular school curriculum which need greater stress, particularly oral language development.
5. One of the students did graduate from the school system.
6. Greater communication with the members of the Hispanic community was attained.
7. Greater awareness of multiculturalism was achieved.

AREAS OF WEAKNESS OF THE PROGRAM

1. Lack of time available to work with students who need attention.
2. Lack of carry-over of instructional activities by the bilingual teacher into the regular classroom. More work needs to be done by the regular program in terms of carrying over techniques which would benefit these students in their regular classroom activities. This is needed in the area of oral language development.
3. Lack of progress by participants as indicated by pretest and posttest results.
4. Lack of consultants who can give direction to our program. They either are not there or we cannot find someone who can provide concrete assistance with the difficulties in working with limited English speaking ability students. The suggestions which have been received appear to be primarily for those bilingual programs where the students are Spanish dominant and/or already are able to read in Spanish.
5. Lack of cooperation with some of the students with whom the instructor has attempted to work. This is particularly true with some of the older students who are of limited English speaking ability and who are opposed to special assistance.
6. Lack of available funding.

7. Heavy teacher load. This past year the instructor became heavily involved as a resource person and guest speaker in classrooms throughout the district. While this was very good for all concerned, as a result of this year's experiences, it appears that this should be restricted in the future and sole attention be given to students in the program. It appears that the objectives were too broad for one individual to cover.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the parent advisory committee be expanded for next year.

2. That a standardized achievement test be given as part of the pre and post testing process.

3. That the emphasis on language development continue at the elementary level. This includes developing the concepts in Spanish as well as in English.

4. That all students who are eligible receive maintenance instruction of language development in Spanish. This should possibly be extended to all bilingual students.

5. That a volunteer aide program be established to assist the bilingual instructor.

Thomas J. Renze
Title I Coordinator

WEST LIBERTY REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM

Fiscal Year 1978

Narrative Evaluation

The primary goal of the West Liberty educational program is to provide means for migrant youngsters to become functional in English and the basic skills areas as quickly as possible. The hope is that these youngsters will be as scholastically capable as their Anglo non-migrant peers as the result of program efforts.

More specifically, the objectives of the West Liberty migrant educational program are as follows:

1. To increase parental involvement in school through such means as:

   a. Registration of migrant youngsters in school.

   b. Parent-teacher conferences (with the regular and bilingual resource teacher in attendance).

   c. Participation as homeroom mothers, etc..

   It is to be noted that program success occurs through the successes of the children with the parents seeing their child's success. We have been very pleased in this area.

2. To increase cultural pluralism through such means as:

   a. Christmas program presented by spanish-speaking youngsters for all elementary school students in which costumes, customs, etc., are depicted and portrayed. We continue to work toward this goal.

3. To increase school attendance. Success here is measured according to individual families.

4. To increase socialization between Anglos and Chicanos. Excellent success.

5. To deliver special services such as:

   a. Hearing referral and assistance

   b. Speech referral and assistance

   c. Special education assistance

Pg 38 - blank

d. Visual referral and assistance (presently two of the migrant learners are legally blind and are being assisted through special instructional materials).

e. Medical referral and assistance.

We have received excellent cooperation between local agencies and the school.

6. To prepare migrant learners to compete successfully in an Anglo world through means such as:

a. Assisting them in increasing their ability in English

b. Assisting them in becoming proficiently bilingual

It is to be noted here that West Liberty has become a community in which the migrant worker "settles out". The local turkey processing plant and other local or nearby industries provide year-round employment for these "settled out" migrants. The bilingual program conducted in West Liberty is unique in that it is conducted during the regular school year with a significant number of "settled out" migrant learners.

In this program, the bilingual resource teacher approach is employed to provide extra help to students for approximately a thirty minute period per day. Here again, the major emphasis is upon developing proficiency in English as soon as possible with Spanish as a vehicle.

The bilingual portion of the West Liberty migrant education program can be further described as attempting to rank learners according to their language development level. Four categories arranged in priority ranking illustrate the program.

1. Monolingual Spanish Speaking

Youngsters in this category are totally Spanish speaking. They receive first priority within the program and the greatest possible amount of assistance from the bilingual teacher(s).

2. Little to No English Speaking Ability

These youngsters are just beginning to function bilingually. While ranked as second in priority, they too receive significant support from the bilingual teacher(s).

3. Speaks English with Difficulty in Academic (Content) Areas

These youngsters are ranked third in program priority. The bilingual teacher(s) provide help in the polishing of skills necessary to function successfully in the content areas.

4. Full Functioning Member of an Academic Classroom

These youngsters are ranked fourth in program priority. They need and receive special help from the bilingual teacher in areas of culture (adaptation to the Anglo culture) plus maintenance of their ability in Spanish, where deemed necessary. This group is receiving the least attention presently.

The Houghton-Mifflin reading tests are applied in each of these category areas from kindergarten on through subsequent grades. Learners in category four are capable of working and do receive the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and other achievement/intelligence instruments as their application is felt to be valid.